



Paper works

contested resource histories in Peru's Huascarán National Park

Rasmussen, Mattias Borg

Published in:
World Development

DOI:
[10.1016/j.worlddev.2017.05.005](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2017.05.005)

Publication date:
2018

Document version
Peer reviewed version

Document license:
[CC BY-NC-ND](#)

Citation for published version (APA):
Rasmussen, M. B. (2018). Paper works: contested resource histories in Peru's Huascarán National Park. *World Development*, 101, 429-440. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2017.05.005>

This is the author's postprint version of an article in *World Development*, vol. 101, pp. 429-440. The authoritative version can be found here:
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2017.05.005>

The present research benefitted from funding from the European Research Council (ERC).
ERC Grant: State Formation Through the Local Production of Property and Citizenship (Ares
(2015)2785650 – ERC-2014-AdG – 662770-Local State).

Paper Works: Contested Resource Histories in Peru's Huascarán National Park

Mattias Borg Rasmussen

Highlights

- Conservation encounters not only “dispossess” people or “reclassify” resources, but mold and reshape local institutions.
- Paperwork is a crucial arena for engagement between protected area administration and community organizations.
- Contestations over landscape resources involve contestations over interpretations of history.
- Community paperwork mediates claims to territorial sovereignty, people, and resources, as well as to history and future.

Summary

Resource histories determine how particular parts of the environment come to be defined as valuable. As elsewhere, protected areas in Latin America link the governance of people, territory, and resources by reinterpreting and reclassifying practices and environments. Set in highland Peru, the article focuses on how such revisions imply contestation of both history and future. It explores particular modes of claiming space through an archeology of the claims to knowledge and legitimacy put forward by a national park and a campesino community, respectively. Claims to space entwine with social struggles about local development where territorial claims are based on different notions of history and interpretations of the esthetic and productive values of the landscape. While the park officials navigate interests of conservation, tourism, and extraction, the campesino community mobilizes a different set of values and interests based on their historical occupation of the territories. These processes of contestation over authority and legitimacy highlight different views on the role of landscapes in the history and progress of local communities. Conservation may not only dispossess people of their land and natural resources, but also of labor and territorial sovereignty. This case shows how an Andean campesino community counters such movements by a wide repertoire of legal and social actions that works simultaneously in legal and extra-legal domains. Paper works mediate claims to territorial sovereignty, people, and resources. These claims involve contestations over interpretations of history which, besides their oral forms, materialize in paperwork such as official communications, community records, and cadastral maps, as well as in visual representations, internal statutes, and deliberate history writing.

Key words

Andes, Peru, conservation, resource struggles, territoriality, historicity

1. Introduction

On June 18, 2014, a letter arrived at the Peruvian National Park Services' (SERNANP) headquarters in Lima. It was signed by the president of a campesino community [comunidad campesina] known as Catac, and demanded "economic compensation and indemnity for territorial infringement, damages and losses" inflicted by a part of the Huascarán National Park in the Cordillera Blanca. If these demands were not met, they would resort to the "corresponding legal as well as social actions". This promise contains a poorly hidden threat: the history of Catac reveals a series of confrontations between the peasants and different people encroaching on their lands: early colonial settlers, a nineteenth-century priest with a keen interest in mining, landowners in the first half of the twentieth century, and then—following the 1969 agrarian reform—the Huascarán National Park after 1975. While legal actions may not worry the park administration unduly, social actions are far more unsettling. In 2001, Catac gained national fame when community members blocked the entrance to one of the region's primary tourist destinations, the easily accessible glacier at Pastoruri. After lengthy court deliberations, it was agreed that the income generated by the entrance fees to the national park at Carpa would be shared equally between the two parties.

On June 27, 2014 park personnel rebutted Catac's claims in an answering letter. The letter was sent to the SERNANP offices in Lima. Short and in a formal, bureaucratic and matter-of-fact tone, it did not concede any reason to the community claims. From Lima, the formal response was communicated to the community presidency. This article unpacks the exchange of letters between the leadership of Catac and the Huascarán National Park, and shows how the implicit threat of reverting to "corresponding legal and social action" relies on a tradition of politics for claiming space that works simultaneously in legal and extra-legal domains. Paper works mediate claims to territorial sovereignty, people, and resources. These claims involve contestations over interpretations of history, which, besides their oral forms, materialize in paperwork such as official communications, community records, and cadastral maps, as well as in visual representations, internal statutes, and deliberate history writing.

In Peru, recent developments have revealed deep tensions both between and within state institutions and campesino communities regarding the course, aims, and means of development (Cameron, 2009, see also, Li, 2015, Rasmussen, 2017, Sosa and Zwarteven, 2012). Ideas about resources and the social relations that constitute these are therefore tied to notions of progress (Rasmussen, 2015, Rasmussen, 2016b). This article explores the contested field that emerges from a claim to resources and local landscapes that in some regards works in remarkably similar ways to extraction: conservation. Like extractive industries, conservation makes claims to territories and landscapes based on particular forms of valuation (Buscher & Dressler, 2012). Landscape values are reconfigured as international priorities filter down to countries. When new resources are identified in the process, institutions are reworked to make claims to these resources. Conservation encounters therefore not only "dispossess" people or "reclassify" resources, but critically mold and reshape local institutions (see also Rasmussen & Lund 2018). Enclosure works on multiple levels at once. Institutions are social arrangements that regulate and structure interactions between actors. Local institutions therefore mediate the relationship between individual and collective action, and between actors, who sometimes operate on

different scales (Agrawal, 2009). Institutions, however, do not exist in a social and political vacuum: they are personified in social actors who actively pursue a variety of interests and seek to define and enforce rules. Institutions thereby also become political arenas. Successful institutions not only enforce existing rules, but in the process of doing so challenge other institutional arrangements and render them illegitimate (Lund, 2008). In short: Institutions are both provisional orders and contentious fields. This article explores the institutional dynamics communities and park administrations produce as they fight not only over the right to claim and define resources and territories, but—in the process of doing so—also over interpretations of the past and choices for the future.

Conservation through protected areas expresses a particular way of seeing, understanding, and producing nature and culture, or environment and society (Brockington et al., 2008, Brockington and Igoe, 2006, West et al., 2006). Protected areas redefine the relationship between nature and culture in a given locality. In the name of conservation what are perceived as natural resources become re-entangled in webs of domination that connect the reordering of space to the exercise of power (Neumann, 2001). Central in the struggles over livelihoods and the governance of natural resources are the ways in which protected areas produce space, place, and people (Neumann, 1998). Therefore, understanding the impacts of conservation entails an analysis of the origins of the contestation over resource territories, the logics of the institutional arrangements, and the uneven powers thus produced (Peluso, 2003). The new configurations of resource territories are accounted for differently by the different actors. In the case of the Galapagos, for example, it has been argued that an ethical code was “developed and imposed on the local people that defined previously adequate, productive and reasonable activities as reprehensible and disgraceful” (Quiroga, 2009, 124). The point, therefore, is that when an area is designated as worthy of conservation, it happens through a process in which plants, animals, people, practices, and territories are reclassified and given new significance. Governments are not alone in undertaking reclassification; local people and community institutions also work actively to attach meaning to places and resources (see also Bluwstein and Lund, 2018). Unable to fence off territories physically, in the case discussed here both community and park must rely on an alternative set of governmental techniques of enclosure. Paperwork is a central strategy in those efforts to enclose resource territories by classifying, indeed claiming, history.

Historically, enclosure has referred to the privatization of village common lands, and to a process of commodifying new aspects of human life as part of a broader transformation in social organization (Grandia, 2012, 4). Studying conservation in upland Guatemala, Lisa Grandia identifies two parallel processes involved in enclosure movements: first, a physical, legal, or political process by which land and other resources are privatized. Thus, tenure over land and other resources is transferred out of the hands of communities. This transformation into commodities reduces their cultural complexity and social embeddedness. Secondly, a cultural, social, and disciplinary process legitimizes those enclosures (ibid.). In this article I outline the first process and discuss how and why the park failed to legitimize its claim to the lands. I do that by building on Himley (2009), who—in discussing conservation projects in Ecuador—argues that the historical landscape claims of the rural communities need to be taken into account alongside their agency and livelihood interests. Like Himley, I underscore the contested nature of the history of such claims and the importance of a skillful narration of this history. The spatiality of resource politics, we discover, is inherently temporal. In claiming space, the past is mobilized and brought into current struggles—for documents are never past, but can be mobilized and recontextualized in new circumstances. Old documents attain - and are given - new lives.

Resources, on the other hand, point forward in time by suggesting that particular landscapes have particular potentialities. How elements of the landscape are defined as resources worthy of either extraction or conservation lay out the future horizons. Identifying resources is therefore tied to these double temporal movements, where the institutional debris of the past—understood as documents and practices linked to institutional arrangements—is constitutive of the future.

The literature on co-management emphasizes that communities are not pre-existing units, but instead are continuously shaped by encounters with other actors and institutions (Agrawal and Gibson, 1999, Brockington, 2004, Brosius et al., 2005). Since communities cannot be defined a priori, analysis of the park–people relationship should capture how the community is produced in the present, and its attendant institutions. It has been suggested that, rather than empowering communities, conservation governance serves as a tool for expanding state views of natural resources; but, also, that some communities may effectively use such tools to strengthen their own position (Caruso, 2011). Co-management arrangements are common as a means to buffer an ill-funded national parks system in a Latin American context (Moorman et al., 2013, Silvius, 2004). But co-management does not necessarily guarantee direct, transparent, and accountable community participation (Adams and Hulme, 2001a, Adams and Hulme, 2001b, Dressler et al., 2010, Steenbergen and Visser, 2016, Tsing et al., 2005). While in Latin America physical displacement may be relatively rare in relation to other regions, the erosion of local economies is a bigger concern (Brockington & Igoe, 2006). In understanding the role of paperwork in claims to territories, resources, and history, I ask two empirical questions. First, how does the presence of the protected areas shape communities and their institutional arrangements for resource governance? Secondly, how do protected areas become part of and partake in territorial dynamics, including resource struggles both within and between communities and other institutions? To pursue answers to my questions, I perform an archeology of the claims to knowledge and legitimacy put forward by the Huascarán National Park (an IUCN Category II Protected Area) and the Catac campesino community of the Ancash highlands of Peru, respectively. These are both territorializing institutional arrangements seeking to gain control over the same space, but they operate with different political repertoires. I show how the enclosure movement relates to the politics of spatial control, exploring the emergence of authority and the capability to draw borders and enforce rules of conduct. Through this analysis I argue that territorial claims are based on different notions of history and interpretations of the esthetic and productive values of the landscape.

The article proceeds as follows. Part 2 outlines the methodological approach. Part 3 reflects on the idea of resource histories. Parts 4–7 constitute the empirical core: (4) a journey through the historical conjunctures marked by struggles over land; (5) the paper bureaucracies governing resource territories; (6) the conservation encounters over the definition of resources; and (7) the micro-politics of history shaping the contested resource histories. Part 8 summarizes and concludes.

2. Methodology

This article is based on prolonged ethnographic engagement with communities in the southern parts of the Cordillera Blanca from 2010 onward. I collected the material discussed in this article between April and July, 2014. The methodological core of this research is ethnographic. It relies on participant observation in meetings and in the everyday work of the community leadership, semi-structured interviews, and numerous visits to the

high-altitude households inside the park perimeter. In addition to this I interviewed key figures in the park administration and followed them in their work in other communities. The letters providing the narrative thrust of this article were given to me by the park administration, and their content is reproduced here with the consent of both the community and the park administration. In the text that follows I will refer to both Catac and the Huascarán National Park as singular units. As I have reported elsewhere (Rasmussen, 2015, see also Diez, 2012, Diez and Ortiz, 2013), the highland peasant communities are notoriously rife with internal conflicts. Catac is no exception, as disputes over access to and control over land, water, and business revenues are frequent. These matters are usually kept inside the community. Outward, Catac seeks to appear as a coherent unit. Such internal tensions and calmer outward demeanors should of course be kept in mind in the analysis that follows.

3. Conceptualizing resource histories

I argue in this article that not only plants, people, practices, and territories become subject to reclassification and reinterpretation when a conservation area is established. History itself is also subject to contestation. More precisely, resource histories entwine with local struggles over the authority to define local territorial development. While the park administration develops strategies for collaborating with more than 50 comunidades campesinas whose territorial arrangements resemble those of Catac, the area is marked by tensions over the right to territory and contested definitions of resources and progress. Geographer Jennifer Lipton (2014) finds that the current challenges to the management of the national park are rooted in two lasting legacies: the 1970 earthquake and the 1969 agrarian reforms instigated by the revolutionary-military government of General Velasco. Here I focus mainly on processes of land tenure transformation and the implications for spatial control. I agree with Lipton that the establishment of the park must be understood through an analysis of institutional conditions at that time, and that the current predicaments of conservation are historically conditioned. However, we need a deeper understanding of how regimes of spatial control wrestle not only for control of resources but also over the capacity to define historical trajectories. At the heart of the issue of contentious resource histories in the Huascarán National Park is therefore a struggle over the legitimate rule of particular resource territories.

History matters in rural territorial dynamics. Transformations of territories are contingent upon historical patterns and inherited structural factors (Ospina Peralta & Hollenstein, 2015). Yet history is not objective and does not exist outside society (see Cruikshank, 2005). The idea of resource histories builds on two theoretical propositions: first, as Harvey (2003) argued from a Marxist perspective, resources do not exist as a thing in themselves. Resources are not abstractions, but are produced by social relations or “modes of production”. Second, we cannot assume the passing of time to be linear in an anthropological understanding of historicity (Hirsch & Stewart, 2005). Time can be punctuated, leap, and loop. Consequently, there is a need to develop the cultural critique of “history”. By historicity Stewart and Hirsch suggest that other understandings of the passing of time be considered: that the ways in which the past is linked to the present is culturally specific. By resource histories, I seek to understand how social relations that identify something as a resource hinge upon the culturally specific ways that ideas and artefacts from the past are mobilized in present and future claims.

Studies of the attempt to understand how claims to resources are grounded historically often invoke ideas about “social memory” or “narration” (Fortmann, 1995, Goldman, 2011, Moore, 1993, Moore, 1998a, Moore, 1998b, Moore, 1999). Donald Moore suggests that landscapes are historical sedimentations of symbolic and material processes. Emphasizing competing cultural constructions that assert resource rights and entitlements, he argues that environmental politics must be understood by paying close attention to social memories and history (Moore, 1998a, 379). Goldman (2011) also directs attention to social memory and the ways in which the Maasai actively narrate their own histories. Such environmental histories, grounded in what Moore terms the micro-politics of place, reveal that the production of conservation landscapes entails multiple and layered struggles over territories and resources. In the Peruvian Andes, communities revert to history as well. But claims to history—the historicity of events and causalities—are not only narrated or practiced. In fact, local politics in the Andes is highly lettered (Diez, 2012, Nuijten and Lorenzo, 2009, Rappaport, 2011, Rasmussen, 2015, Salomon and Niño-Murcia, 2011). While I agree with the basic proposition of Moore in its different reiterations—that resource struggles are both symbolic and material—I believe that there is a need for further scrutiny of the materiality of community struggles over resources. I focus in particular on the production of documents and maps as they become mobilized in both legal and social struggles, and therefore work in tandem with both oral representations and social mobilizations. Studies on counter-mapping in Ecuador and Bolivia highlight the spatiality of community representations (Gustafson, 2009, Radcliffe, 2010). Extending this perspective, in this article I unravel the historicity of representations of territory, resources, and people. I focus in particular on how the social relations that produce resources are mediated by paper and implicated in the vernacular “bureaucratic material infrastructure” (Hull, 2012) of the highland campesino communities.

The campesino communities of Peru are apt starting points for understanding the local production of documents and maps in claims over resources and to history. These territorial, economic, and social enterprises control vast Peruvian highland regions through elaborate local bureaucracies exercising “vernacular statecraft” (Colloredo-Mansfeld, 2009, Rasmussen, 2015). As I have argued elsewhere, campesino communities work as an outsourced sovereign political body, their existence being both tied to as well as defined against central government. Here, I detail how territories, resources, and people are ruled internally through documents and other artefacts of government (Lund, 2006). Further, I show how bureaucratic procedures not only serve to rule by record (Nuijten and Lorenzo, 2009, Osorio Bautista, 2013), accounting for individual contributions and transgressions in relation to community assets, but also have important ramifications for social relations at other scales that equally contribute to the identification of resources. To illustrate that point I unpack the exchange of letters between a campesino community in the southern parts of Peru’s Cordillera Blanca and the Huascarán National Park. Attending to the production, circulation, and reactivation of documents and maps, I show how the reinterpretation of history is deeply implicated in resource struggles, and argue that such reinterpretation and reworking of documents reshape local community institutions as they encounter processes of territorial enclosure.

Latin America’s protected areas have been instrumental in nation-building projects, and in different ways in the territorial consolidation of nation-states. Even today they form part of an overall territorial management strategy, articulating claims to territories and control over people and resources (Morea, 2016). All the same, protected areas are increasingly embracing local communities. Studies of conservation and livelihoods with a historical perspective have argued that this approach works as a manifestation of (post-)colonial resource governance and appropriation (Neumann, 1998, Roth, 2004). Conservation policies, often imposed by colonial

states on colonized people, have also functioned as a way of controlling people by reproducing and enforcing imperial practices and the asymmetries of power (Beinart & Hughes, 200, 3). Unlike the colonial legacy in Africa, early protected areas in Latin America were often explicitly framed as part of the consolidation of national borders in a still unstable region in the late 19th and early 20th centuries (Grove, 1995, Neumann, 2001, Valdivia et al., 2014, Wakild, 2007, Wakild, 2009a, Wakild, 2009bb, Wakild, 2014, Wakild, 2015, Zimmerer and Carter, 2002). The number of protected areas in Latin America has increased dramatically since the 1990s, although its historical precedents date back to the beginning of the twentieth century when the first parks were established in Mexico and Argentine Patagonia (Cushman, 2005, Cushman, 2013, Wakild, 2009a, Wakild, 2009bb, Wakild, 2013, Zimmerer and Carter, 2002). Regional studies currently focus on such topics as the proliferation of private protected areas in the Southern Cone; the role of conservationist NGOs' priorities vis-à-vis communities; biodiversity; and ecotourism (Fletcher, 2014, Gonzalez-Roglich et al., 2012, Grandia, 2012, Hill and Hill, 2011, Holmes, 2010, Jones, 2012, Méndez-López et al., 2014, Sundberg, 1998). There is evidence that the establishment and management of strictly protected areas has nurtured already existing territorial and cultural struggles (Barker, 1980, Galafassi, 2013, Lipton, 2014, Miniconi and Guyot, 2010, Rasmussen, 2016b, Trentini, 2016, Young, 1997).

Conservation in diverse Peru is most evident on the eastern margins of the Andes, where the high mountains gradually turn into lowland jungle (Rodríguez ad Young, 2000, Young, 1997). The first actual law on conservation was implemented only in 1975: until then, the few existing parks had all been created by presidential decree. Established on July 1, 1975, the Huascarán National Park covers an area of 340,000 hectares of spectacular highland scenery (Decreto Supremo 0622-75-AG). It became the nucleus of a larger Biosphere Reserve in 1977, and in 1985 was recognized as a UNESCO World Heritage Site. It is located in the most extensive glaciated area anywhere in the world's tropics. It encompasses 27 peaks over 6,000 m, including Peru's highest, which has also given the park its name. From the outset, park activities have stressed two main preoccupations: tourism and the conservation of flora, fauna, and water resources. An enduring imbalance between tourism and conservation was noted by Grötzbach (2003, 132) in a review of tourism in the Cordillera Blanca region. The park administration needs to ensure that the tourist infrastructure is working inside the park nucleus in order to ensure continued funding for conservation initiatives. As I will detail below, the park's apparent emphasis on tourist revenues rather than the conservation of ecosystems did not escape the notice of critical community members in Catac.

Conservation in these cultural and humanized landscapes, with shifting relations to the centers of power and the environment, requires an understanding of the history of such places (Young, 1997, 144). As noted above, the establishment of the Huascarán National Park in 1975 happened at the intersection between the earthquake of 1970 and agrarian reforms of the revolutionary military government of Velasco a year earlier (Barker, 1980, Lipton, 2014). Initially seeking to eliminate unwanted human activity, the current park administration recognizes that people inhabit and make use of the high-altitude land. Apart from the near-total abandonment of the practice of burning pastures around the San Juan celebration in late June, the majority of herders and farmers are affected only to a limited extent. An exception is the local construction of productive infrastructure such as irrigation canals; transportation infrastructure such as roads; and extractive activities aiming at either precious metals or building materials, all of which are local signs of progress and development (Rasmussen, 2016b). The initial assumption of the park founders was that the local population would reduce their dependence on high-altitude livestock and gradually become more dependent on income generated by tourism

(Lipton, 2008, 134). That has not been the case: currently, overgrazing and the depletion of wetlands are of major concern to conservationists working in the area (Bury et al., 2013, Polk and Young, 2013).

One of the campesino communities affected by the establishment of the Huascarán National Park is Catac, whose total territory of approximately 66,000 hectares is overlapped partly (roughly 62%, Bury et al., 2011) by the park. Through mutual enclosures, both the community and the park administration claim legal title to these territories. Conservation enclosures have served as a means of accumulation by dispossession, opening up resource access to private actors (Corson, 2011, Kelly, 2011). Although entailing some degree of material and symbolic dispossession, the situation affecting the Catac community in highland Ancash is different from what is described elsewhere in this issue in relation to the African context. The Huascarán National Park, however, sees itself as a bulwark against such incursions. In our conversations park personnel would readily refer me to maps of mining concessions. Such visual representations render the park an island in a sea of red squares indicating mine concessions. The establishment of the national park has therefore not opened up an avenue for marauding capitalism, but instead has redefined the proper uses of space from those of exploitation and production to recreation and leisure. This is a form of dispossession that feeds into longer trajectories of struggles for land and recognition in the Andes. I unpack that historical context and its current relevance below.

4. Historical conjunctures: *La recuperación de tierras*

‘Recuperar means that that which they have taken away from you comes back again to the bosom of the community. Based on the struggle. The recovery, the struggle. There have been, uff, what problems: attorneys, lawyers, congressmen. One time a senator, delegates, everyone has come here. We went to the courtroom. We went to the congress ... Unfortunately ... the corruption amongst authorities continues. But the community of Catac has fought a lot, and positive influences have enabled our recovery to reach the point where we find ourselves today.(author interview with Don M., twice president of Catac)¹

Central to the self-understanding of Catac is the period locally known as *la recuperación de tierras*, the recovery of lands. This section discusses the historical conjunctures that shaped the formation of what today makes up the territories of Catac, stretching from 3,500 m above sea level at the shores of the Santa River to the ice-covered peaks more than 5,000 m above sea level that mark the limits of the Santa River watershed (see also Bury et al., 2011, Bury et al., 2013, Mark et al., 2010). At the time of fieldwork in mid-2014, the campesino community of Catac had about 750 members. Each member—often men but sometimes women—represents an entire household, meaning that this particular campesino community is involved in the everyday governance of the productive resources of several thousand people. Every five years, new members are allowed to join: in late 2014, more than 200 new households were integrated into Catac, making the actual number of associates reach almost 1,000.² This is, in other words, a vast social organization covering extensive territory and governing the productive activities of a significant amount of people. Being a member, one gains access to land, the possibility of providing labor, and the right to receive a share of the surplus earned by the community enterprises. In return for the taxes collected on the basis of livestock ownership and membership,

the comuneros have a number of social rights, including payment of funeral expenses when the member dies and a number of scholarships to the university in Huaraz.³ The community therefore provides not only membership and the means of production, but also substantial social security—something that the Peruvian state largely fails to extend to its rural citizens.

The campesino community has its headquarters just south of the town, occupying some of the old buildings from the hacienda run by the Cáceres family until the agrarian reform. On the walls of the utility storehouse, a collage of photographs documents key moments in the community's history, including the 2001 occupation of the entrance to Pastoruri mentioned above. A much larger main building, in concrete and painted green, was constructed in the mid-1980s. It contains a large meeting hall and a number of offices, including that of the president. To approach his office one must present one's documents to the secretary in the waiting room, surrounded by portraits of all the community's presidents since the early 1970s. The presidential office is the only one with a carpet. It was in that room that I finally—on my last day in Catac in 2014—got to see the official map that demarcates the historically grounded territorial claims. As with all other documents held by the campesino community—minutes from meetings, receipts, accountancy books, registers of members' possessions of animals and land, etc.—this map is zealously guarded for future reference and claim.⁴

The map was a representation of territorial claims in Catac founded on a document dating from 1714, when a royal visitor, Tomás de Urdinola, gave titles to the seven communities (ayllus) of Recuay.⁵ This document, granting members of these ayllus land rights at the date of issue, was to gain importance from the twentieth century onward, when the grandparents of the people with whom I was working had lost their lands to influential families linked to the mining industry, the military, and the church. In the 1940s, across the Andean highlands, increasing unrest among its indigenous inhabitants led to an intensification of territorial claims. In 1946, the peasants of Catac were recognized by the central government as an Indigenous Community. Until the agrarian reform of 1969, this was the denomination of what is now the campesino community. They were recognized as a community by the state, but did not attain the right to the lands they were occupying while paying rent to the landowners. The title from 1946 only included about 10 hectares of land. In this context, the old 1714 title attained new life, mobilized as a way of justifying territorial claims but pointing to the historical dispossession that led to a predominantly white and mestizo elite taking control of these territories.

La recuperación de tierras refers to a particular historical period in which Catac began to (re-)occupy the lands that they currently hold. The recovery of lands in Catac was part of a wider trend in the rural areas, where a wave of invasions of hacienda lands marked the pre-reform era of the early 1960s (Seligmann, 1995). There has been a tradition of land invasions in Peru, which has generally been accepted as a means of dealing with contested land issues. The growth of the larger cities and most definitely Lima happened through a similar process in which peasants invaded hacienda lands and then subsequently made legal arrangements to secure official title to the territories they had invaded (Golte & Adams, 1990). In Catac, la recuperación started in the 1950s when tensions mounted in the relationship between the landowners and the peasants of Catac due to the expansion of the Utcuyacu Hacienda, which led to the displacement of the campesino families in what is now the southern part of the Catac territory. For over a decade, families who had been living off the land in this area were scattered across the provinces of Recuay and Chiquian, searching for livelihoods through jobs (when they could be found), rented agricultural plots, and tenured animals.⁶ On October 11, 1963, a physical

encounter between peasants and police resulted in more than 200 arrests, but also in the gradual takeover of these lands.⁷ This confrontation marked the turning point in the decades of struggle for their territorial rights; little by little, they occupied lands, gaining rights to it by evicting landowners (Osorio Bautista, 2013). This has been a slow, gradual process, the last recovery happening as late as 2005 in the northernmost sector, known as Chacay.

The process of social and legal recognition of territorial rights is obscured by the presence of the national park, which is making counterclaims to portions of the same territory. A former president of Catac revealed to me how surprised the leadership of the community were in the aftermath of the Pastoruri lawsuit, when they discovered that the park had been granted some of the high ground to which they believed they had secured their titles.⁸ Legally, in order to complete the transactions of land ownership, the territory moves through three steps: occupation, which was what Catac accomplished through the recovery; recognition, in which the titles to the land are given to the proprietor; and the verification or *saneamiento físico legal*, which confirms through ocular inspection that the territory ascribed through the title deed is indeed theirs alone (see article 47 of the internal statute of CC Catac). The process is overseen by the Office for the Formalization of Informal Property (COFOPRI), which has its office in the regional capital of Huaraz. The last step opens up an arena of contestation of which the Huascarán National Park has taken advantage. Portions of the Catac claims are therefore in legal dispute, with two sets of titles that give both Catac and the park rights to the land. In other words, both the Catac and the park are territorializing entities seeking to gain control over the same piece of land. I elaborate on this contest in Section 5 of this article.

This struggle over resources and territories forms the core of the self-understanding of the Cataquinos as a particularly courageous and well-organized community.⁹ It is also a struggle rooted in a deep history of social injustice. In 1928, the Marxist indigenist intellectual Mariátegui (2005 [1928]) famously stated that the problem of the Indian is the problem of the land. While the situation regarding land tenure in the highlands has changed via social processes and land reforms, the problem of the land remains the core issue for highland peasant communities. They institutionalize spatial control and often link it to their historical claims. These are partially autonomous institutions; while their competencies are sanctioned by law, they also wield considerable territorial sovereignty, meaning in theory that 1) nothing can happen inside the community boundaries without the approval of either presidency or general assembly; and that 2) the community can sanction legal transgressions. The following section looks at how the historical conjunctures shaping the productive activities of Catac, as well as its territorial expansion, translate into the everyday governance of people, resources, and territory.

5. Paper bureaucracies: Changing resource territories

We are a small group of people sitting on some green pasture next to an abandoned corral. In the background, the mighty Qeullaraju Mountain towers above us with a persistent glare from its remaining glaciers. Apart from me, the invited guest to this meeting, the group consists of the president for the OCI (Organ of Internal Control), the president of the Specialized Committee for Pastures, a community member who has posted a complaint against her neighbor for regularly transgressing with his animals into her assigned pastures, and the defendant. This is the community bureaucracy at work: following an official complaint—written, stamped and

signed—the relevant institutions act to enforce community regulations. As we sit on the coarse grass, the president of the pasture committee diligently notes down the result of today’s visual inspection. After completion, the text is read out aloud, and as a token of agreement we all affix our signatures and personal ID numbers. The book is then stamped by the representatives of the OCI and the specialized committee.¹⁰

The territories in Catac are crisscrossed with boundaries. Like any community, Catac is rife with internal boundary transgressions such as the one described above.¹¹ Internally, different sectors, different production zones, and consequently, different residents also have their assigned territory. The specialized committees that can act on behalf of the community president work to resolve internal disputes over the use of pastures, farmlands, and irrigation waters. Such transgressions are commonplace in the high Andes. Complaints are filed on paper, solely, and their resolution is documented in the minutes signed by both parties. While internal affairs are settled by committees under the presidency, external conflicts in relation to either the neighboring peasant communities, private land owners, or the national park must be handled directly by the community president himself. Here, too, paper works to mediate claims, both articulating and settling disputes.

One of the contentious borders preoccupying the community presidency is physically located inside what is considered to be Catac territory, but legally and institutionally it marks an external relation: the domain of the national park. The line that demarcates the territories of the Huascarán National Park roughly cut the territories of Catac in half. With site-specific variations, it roughly follows the 4,000 m contour lines around the high peaks. Only some communities retain titles inside the park, but around its entire perimeter more than 50 campesino communities claim user rights inside the park nucleus. Lipton interviewed Lorenzo Champa, who was working to establish the park boundaries. He recalls how he met with resistance from the local communities, who did not understand why their lands were being allocated to the national park: “What park? These lands are for us. How can you take them away? We live on these lands” (Lipton, 2014, 827). In the interviews referred to by Lipton, there is no mention of any further reflection on this praxis of land appropriation. Another informant, Don M., told me:

‘The park made its map and began to place boundary markers (hitos). Without consultation with the community. They made their map and placed the boundary markers. So I asked ‘why?’ This is property of the community. That is why we in some places made the boundary markers disappear. And from there began the legal trial with the park.’¹²

Lipton reveals that a majority of her interviewees from around the park perimeter were not aware of the exact location of park boundaries (2014, 828–9). By contrast, in Catac I found that people were very much aware of these borders, but did not respect them when tilling the soil or herding livestock. In spite of initial attempts to achieve an impact, boundary drawing has had little effect on the everyday governance of the smallholders in Catac. And yet it is subject to intense political maneuvers on behalf of the central community presidency. The national economic growth of Peru has not gone unnoticed in Catac, and there is a growing wish to exploit the mineral deposits in the park nucleus. Catac is not only a collective landownership, but also a collectively owned business (see also Fe Celi, 2012). The exploitation of the rich mineral deposits in the high valleys would be a

welcome addition to the sometimes meager gains from the community enterprise. Furthermore, Catac finds itself in a situation in which people are increasingly leaving the countryside, finding better opportunities in the urban job market, partly due to higher levels of education. So while Catac sees itself in a situation where it needs to redefine and refine its economic strategies by expanding its business portfolio, the management plan (to which I direct attention below) and the legal decree by which the park was founded seek to emphasize that only traditional activities are allowed inside the park.

In the letter that the presidency of Catac sent to the park services in Lima, they noted the constraints that the park allegedly imposes on local economic activities, most importantly on improved water infrastructures and extractive activities. As suggested in the letter, the peasants of Catac perceive such activities as subject to challenge by park regulations:

‘[The projects] have been delimited by the Law of Creation of the Park, limiting us in every way in the execution of our projects, delaying their viability with bureaucratic requirements and authorizations that are demanded for all projects.’¹³

Both the campesino community and the national park are institutional arrangements grounded in territorial logics that overlap physically as well as in contested legal claims. Such claims hinge upon different ideas about what counts as resources and what historical dynamics have created places such as Catac. The resource territories in Catac are shifting, and so is the influence that the park may exercise on their development. While the park only limits traditional practices to some extent, it reduces the possible expansion of the business portfolio of the Catac community as a collective business enterprise. Shifting relations to the land are, in other words, not reflected in the way that the park administration represents community practices. Seeing the area as an object of conservation, the park emphasizes new places on the basis of a particular kind of environmental knowledge, and the attendant esthetic values mean that these places are articulated in new ways to other markets. While the articulation of markets was embraced by the comuneros in Catac, the way that these dynamic territories were “frozen” in time by conservation imaginaries hardly concurred with their own vision of resource exploitation and development—or with the territorial sovereignty that is constitutive of the community as a social and productive collectivity. The following section examines further the disputes over the nature and control of resources that are produced in encounters over conservation.

6. Conservation encounters: Disputing resources

Every five years, ideally, the national park elaborates its Plan Maestro, a management plan. This is a strategy paper and a tool for governance. In a broader perspective, management plans are often seen as procedural exercises removed from practice, rendering technical what is actually a political act (Lund, 2015). A management plan therefore not only concerns ecologies, protecting landscapes and ecosystems, but is also linked directly to the protection (or not) of local livelihoods (Ravnborg, 2008). The Huascarán management plan connects local concerns about how the park can actually practice conservation with nation-level

conservation plans. These, in turn, are influenced by international trends, and the most recent one—for example—has a much stronger emphasis on local participation. Notoriously distanced from actual practice, management plans are nonetheless key documents for understanding how the park administration envisions its role in local development, and how it divides the territories into different zones. In the management plan, a map of many colors displays how rather monolithic representations of resources are imposed on the inhabited landscapes. By proposing different mechanisms for the definition and control of space, the park challenges the sovereignty of the campesino community to determine its own course.

As outlined in the section above, the contentious issue in this exchange of letters is the definition of resources and the distribution of their benefits, rather than the legal battlefields. There is a mutual silence regarding the prolonged jurisdictional conflicts between Catac and the park administration.¹⁴ Since 1997, there has been a conflict (as yet unresolved) regarding the border of the park running through the community territories. And there is also no mention of the spectacular legal battle between the two that began with the roadblock at the entrance to Pastoruri in 2001, and ended in court in Huaraz six years later. The absence of these two important components of the history of the relationship between park and community by both parties is remarkable, and yet suggests that different kinds of struggle are indeed fought in different arenas. In the community leadership's letter to the central parks services in Lima, they focus on the process of resource appropriation and limitation, and its impact on community development:

‘The Law of the Creation of the Huascarán National Park limits and restrains. The Campesino community of Catac finds itself limited and restrained, because of which it cannot carry out and develop projects of mining, irrigation, and others that would result in the benefit of our population.’

In this section of the letter, the contentious definition of resources stands out clearly. As mentioned above, the park sees itself as a bulwark against the encroaching mining concessions that mark the territories of Andean Peru. Occupying an island in the midst of future mineral exploitation and environmental degradation, the park employees revealed to me in several instances that they perceive themselves as opposing not so much the local campesino communities as the more powerful actors in the financial and industrial sectors—and, consequently, given the current political conjuncture (see Rasmussen, 2016a), the political sector as a whole.

The Master Plan frames the park management strategies as participatory. On paper, it provides a central tool for governing the territories of the national park in collaboration with the local stakeholders. The Master Plan is intended to guide the management's planning activities both in its nucleus (the actual park) and the buffer zone (these combine to make up the core of the biosphere reserve, which covers a much greater area). According to law, the plan has a lifespan of five years, but this current one (2010–2015) is only the third since 1995. Before that date no such document existed. During my fieldwork, the process of zoning for the 2015–2020 Master Plan was delayed by budget constraints, and the bulk of the work was being carried out through remote sensing.

The leadership during my fieldwork in Catac had never actually seen the management plan. Yet both letters from Catac and the park affirm that the document that mediates their interactions is the park Master Plan, stipulated by article 20 in the Ley de Áreas Naturales Protegidas, (Law of Protected Areas, Law N° 26834). Another document, the Plan de Conservación de la Biodiversidad de la Comunidad Campesina de Catac, also stipulates the intersections between conservation and rural development in the area, but from the point of view of the campesino community. It was prepared by a former park employee hired by Catac, and contains strategies for the involvement of Catac in the conservation efforts. However, the letter notes that

until this date, in a controversial, irrational and random way, the Huascarán National Park has unjustifiedly been delaying [the campesino plan], setting up traps and arguing for subjective situations so as to deny us our requirements.

To translate this somewhat mazy sentence: although aware of its existence, the park administration had derailed the potential outcome of the local conservation plan. From the perspective of the park—so the counterargument goes in the park's written reply to the community's claims—the Biodiversity Conservation Plan of Catac has never entered the Documents Filing Desk (*mesa de partes*), and as they write, “the reason why there is no knowledge of that document and there would be no room for declarations in that regard”. In other words, the authorizing office of the park has not officially received the Plan and, consequently, cannot act according to it, even though they are aware of its existence. The park's reliance on a scruple over a technicality seems to affirm what the letter from Catac implies: that the inflexibility of the park bureaucracy hinders the claims put forward by the campesino community. As has been observed elsewhere (Nuijten & Lorenzo, 2009), the campesino communities in general are no strangers to meticulous documentation of expenditures and tasks carried out by authorities. While both Catac and the park recognize the importance of documents, rendering the Catac Plan invalid on a procedural technicality underscores the uneven balance between the two claimants to the territory.

In the introduction, I mentioned the conflict evolving around the tourist facilities and revenues of Pastoruri. In a curious replay of the 1963 social mobilization, the members of Catac had blocked the road to claim access to resources. As observed elsewhere in the Andes (e.g., Albro, 2005, Colloredo-Mansfeld, 2002, Colloredo-Mansfeld, 2007, Colloredo-Mansfeld, 2009), protests, blockades, and mobilizations are integral parts of the political repertoire of peasant organizations. In the case of Catac, these social movements are accompanied by an elaborate legal portfolio. While the letter from Catac thus contains the possibility of returning to past tensions, as stated in the introduction, perhaps more importantly, it contains a critique of the way that the relationship between the park and Catac is mediated through bureaucratic procedures. Rather than demanding the annulment of the park, the letter highlights how documents prepared as instruments to guide interactions between the claimants to the territories are not being put to their proper use. Thus, Catac does not attempt to dismantle the Huascarán National Park in itself. By directing the letter to the national park services in Lima they argue that the local park management fails to deliver what is outlined as the legal basis of the park. They engage with the official legal language by turning the management plan against the park, finding their backing in legislation on both conservation and peasant communities. Such “forum shopping” (von Benda-Beckmann, 1981) hinges upon the micro-politics of history: the ways in which the past is represented and mobilized in present claims to define future trajectories. This is the theme of the following section.

7. The Micro-politics of history: Strategic omissions and situated representations

The letter to the Park Services ends like this:

Noting that more than 28 [38] years have passed since the creation of the Huascarán National Park, we consider the imperative need to be economically COMPENSATED and INDEMNIFIED for the territorial limitations, the impossibility of developing ourselves economically, the inability to rationally exploit natural resources, the bureaucratic traps, the tedious requirements for authorization, and others. Therefore, we demand the corresponding economic recognition for LOST GAINS and EMERGENT DAMAGE, including interest and others.(capital letters in the original)

The dominant theme in this closing paragraph is control over local resource territories. As noted in the introduction, territorial sovereignty connects present resource exploitation to both past trajectories and the potential of future developments. Resource histories are therefore particular temporal configurations that establish such connection through strategic omissions and situated representations. “The Comunidad Campesina de Catac has its origins in pre-Incaic times”, reads the very first line of the internal statute of the community (CCC p. 8, see note x). That is a claim that expresses a very wide understanding of origin. I will not argue for or against it here, but look into the revision of history to which it points. History—and the ability to tell history—matters a great deal. In 2010, the General Assembly of Catac—which is the highest authority in the community—summoned teacher Eliseo Pérez Calvo to write the History of the Catac Campesino community (Perez Calvo, 2010). Written under the mandate of the general assembly, this book outlines the history of Catac. And it is, indeed, a deep history. The book begins by arguing that the pre-Incaic Recuay Culture (Lau, 2005) should have been named the Catac Culture, effectively relocating the regional power balance from the traditional provincial capital Recuay to the current economic center in Catac. This fundamental point demonstrates the centrality of history and narration. Past struggles are presented as very much a part of the present, and a tight connection is maintained between symbolic and real control over resources and control over the present lives of people.

The course of history in the area is even debated at a very personal level. At the park office in Huaraz I was presenting some preliminary conclusions to a group of park officials, the current and a former chief of the park, and some invited guests.¹⁵ One of the employees of the park—who are also from the area—revealed that one of the territories currently in dispute was actually the former possession of his uncle, and his version of the legal and historical background for this particular section varied greatly from what I would be told in Catac: he said that the territory of Queshque had never been part of Catac, and that the community members in Catac had taken advantage of the territorial turmoil to secure a further extension of their lands. That was the version I had also heard from the in-house lawyer.¹⁶ This demonstrates how the representatives of the park often try to delegitimize claims by reference to alternative pasts: in this version, the peasants are not represented as direct inheritors of past occupants, but rather as opportunistic settlers taking advantage of the turmoil following the agrarian reforms. Such representations involve questioning the lineages to the most recent claimants to

territories, such as those occupying Queshque; the lineage issue was also further complicated by the expulsion of community members from the southern territories in the 1950s. Importantly, it also raises doubts about the lineage claims traced to members of the ayllus that were granted territorial rights in 1714.

These letters, therefore, do not only express different interpretations of the laws that govern protected areas and peasant communities. More importantly, they highlight the ability to interpret the historical events that shape the current relationship between the park and Catac. It therefore goes beyond lasting legacies, in the sense that it is the very power to represent the course of history that is at stake. Neither recognizes the claims made by the opposing claimant: to park officials, Catac is making claims to territories and resources that used to belong to others. When park employees suggest that the ownership of an area such as Queshque is not based on a long-term relationship with the land, but is a rather recent construct that came out of the aggressive territorial expansion of the campesino community, they effectively disconnect the linkage between the 1714 document and the present-day patterns of land tenure. In other words, the boundaries that Catac draws and displayed to me on that day in the president's office, which are based on a deep sense of historical justice, are interpreted by the park as opportune usurpations rather than a just recovery of lands. Such narratives of parallel land occupations effectively delegitimize community claims to resources, and thus their ability to determine future development pathways (Rasmussen, 2016b).

Effectively, according to the management plan and the way that prior occupancy is questioned, the park grants access to the community members in an area where Catac people believe that they have property rights. Access being granted, rather than gained, inverts the relationship between this and property by effectively dismantling the institutions that mediate such access (see Ribot & Peluso, 2003). Granting access here works as a form of subordination. It is a symbolic exercise of power unacceptable in a territory that is believed to be somehow beyond legal property: the people of Catac argue that they have the historical right to define their own destiny. The legal titles merely affirm historical justice. To be denied the right to property, and thereby the local sovereignty that is implied by the Catac statute and regulations as outlined above, is therefore not only a matter of access to resources, but more fundamentally a matter of whose history counts. And, therefore, whose future counts. Whereas rights can be backed legally, the discursive and real change from property rights to access abilities is seen by the community members as a violation of the historical victories and a historical justice undone. The point here is that by having access granted but the property in legal dispute, the people of Catac are feeling disenfranchised by the very definitional disputes over what counts as legitimately exploitable resources.

It is indeed a curious replay of the often contradictory relationship between highland campesino communities and central government in Peru. Strategic alignments and interests shift. The presidency of the campesino community does not position the community in opposition to central government or refuse its priorities *ex ante*. Following a conflict over mining orchestrated partly from Catac (one I have described in detail in Rasmussen, 2016a), I met bewilderment among park personnel who noted community support for a mining project in nearby Recuay. Yet from a perspective of resource histories and territorial sovereignty it made perfect sense. The campesino communities are robust institutions that connect territorial claims to ideas about historical justice and sovereign resource exploitation, but their robustness is rooted in resource territories and how these should be exploited to ensure their future development.

8. Conclusion: Paper works

The quintessential Peruvian frontier is the Amazon, where cattle ranchers, gold miners, oil and gas companies, agro-industries, coca growers, colonists, and indigenous populations all compete over the control of space and resources (Santos-Granero & Barclay, 2002). However, recent changes in the Peruvian highlands, where mining is intensifying, fundamentally challenge not only water resources and landscape esthetics, but also institutional and legal orders (Bebbington and Bury, 2013, Bury et al., 2013). These frontier spaces are a central backdrop to the maneuvers described in this article. What I have explored here, though, is a different kind of frontier space, where the parties are caught in a deadlock of only partially recognized claims and ongoing institutional competition over jurisdictions (see also Colloredo-Mansfeld et al., this volume). The fragmented territorialization of the national park has created a situation in which competing institutions recurrently pose claims to control space and define resources. The major earthquake in 1970, contemporaneous to the agrarian reform, created a situation in which regimes of property became unsettled and institutions struggled to claim legitimacy and gain authority to control tracts of land. These frontier spaces quickly became colonized by emerging institutions, but in sites such as Catac where the level of local organization and prior occupancy was greater, the struggles for control over land entered a new epoch. The commodification of the landscapes, the identification of new exploitable resources—partly introduced by the park—also fundamentally changed the trajectory of land use in Catac. Accompanied by other business ventures, the campesino community saw its economic position strengthened by the influx of tourists, and what started as a struggle for land was combined with a struggle for revenues.

In Catac they feel invaded by the national park; they feel that their chances for development and progress are being hindered by the enforcement of its regulations. Others before me in other contexts have also observed that conservation efforts can be institutional arrangements by which people are dispossessed of land, labor, natural resources, and sovereignty through social, political and economic strategies (Brockington, 2002, Li, 2007, West et al., 2006). This case, however, showed how people of an Andean campesino community resort to a wide repertoire of legal and social actions to counter such movements. It focused in particular on the role of paperwork and how such strategies work in tandem with vernacular governmental forms of claiming space. There is a clear continuity from past struggles over the land to the present-day legal and physical encounters between the Catac and the Huascarán National Park. Furthermore, the ways in which the past is grasped in the exchange of letters and the ongoing debates as to the future of the territories show how histories are always partial and always positioned.

All points in the letter were refused by the park. Reluctant to recognize the historicity of the peasant communities, the park often hides behind obscure legal language and gray zones. The *recuperación de tierras* brought attention to a different vocabulary; one of emancipation, independence, justice, and sovereignty. The establishment of the national park failed to establish legitimate grounds for the park authorities to function. They may have the authority vested in them by the state, but they are not recognized as fully legitimate. The people from Catac are not the only ones who follow the path of conservation with some reluctance. Regional and local governments, authorities on water, and other state institutions continually forget to include the park in their construction processes (Rasmussen, 2016b).

Arguments such as Neumann's (2001) emphasize the convergence between state territorializations and conservation. While conservation in Peru is also deeply connected with regimes of spatial control, alignment with dominant political trends in the capital is limited. In fact, in a milieu of aggressively exploitative politics, the park—with its insistence on the preservation of vicuña and condors—seems to offer rather less support for the growth discourse of the Ministry of Finance than do the entrepreneurial peasants of Catac. Thus, even though Peru is steadily moving toward its goal of placing 25 percent of its territory under the protective wings of the National Parks Services, the contradictions of government policy are evident in the ways that natural resources are brought under control by different state entities.

This analysis of the exchange of letters between a campesino community and a national park reveals paperwork dynamics that are of importance beyond the high Andes. First, the “discovery” of new resources not only reshapes community relationships to the market, but also fundamentally reconfigures the community institutions that seek to govern such newly identified resources. This point is similar to what has been argued in the vast literature on co-management that I refer to in the introduction, where institutions are seen not as predefined entities, but as social arrangements that emerge in relation to resources and political processes. The material discussed here suggests that such reworkings of institutions are not linear, but that documents and histories are employed, enacted, and reinterpreted in the process. That leads to the second point, that paperwork emerges as a crucial arena for engagement between park administration and community authority. The exchange of letters is the clearest instance of such materializations of the interface between these institutions. But in the everyday governance of these resource territories, too, we see that historical events and circumstances are zealously noted down, recorded, and represented. Techniques of territorial and resource enclosure therefore work both from within a state logic, relying on (partial) recognition, and at the margins of (or even in opposition to) the state. Community institutions adapt vernacular forms of statecraft that not only mimic governmental choreographies of governance, but re-contextualize these micro-political forms by placing them within particular resource territories. Contestations over resource histories in Queshque, where park employees delegitimize community occupation by reference to prior ownership while the community crafts new pathways of development based on ideals of production zones, is a case in point. In fact, the overall message in the letter is that the community has been deprived of its own capability to define its future. It is here that the historicity of resources gains its importance, leading to the third point: such interfaces between park and community are crucial for the local historiographies through which the latter is consciously crafted. The letters exchanged therefore do not only communicate directly to the park services in Lima, whose name is on the letterhead, nor only indirectly to the local park administration, who must respond. The exchange of letters also works as a form of metacommunication at community level: community paperwork mediates claims to territorial sovereignty, people, and resources—and ultimately, to both history and future.

Acknowledgments

I deeply appreciate the time spent with me, both in the park offices in Huaraz as well as those in Catac who invited me into their homes and into their gorgeous landscapes and the social struggles to secure these. The quality of this paper has been enhanced from comments and suggestions made by Karine Gagné, Karsten Paerregaard, Rudi Colloredo-Mansfeld, Christian Lund, Muriel Côte, and Jens Friis Lund. Three anonymous reviewers provided engaged and critical comments beyond what I would normally expect. Funding for research

and writing was provided by the Danish Research Council. During fieldwork, I was affiliated to the Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú in Lima.

References

- Adams, W. M., & Hulme, D. (2001b). If community conservation is the answer in Africa, what is the question? *Oryx*, 35(3), 193–200. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-3008.2001.00183.x>.
- Adams, W., & Hulme, D. (2001a). Conservation and community: Changing narratives, policies and practices in African conservation. In D. Hulme & M. Murphree (Eds.), *African wildlife and livelihoods: The promise and performance of community conservation*. Oxford: James Curry.
- Agrawal, A. (2009). Local institutions and adaptation to climate change. In *Social dimensions of climate change: Equity and vulnerability in a warming world* (pp. 173–198). Herndon, VA: World Bank.
- Agrawal, A., & Gibson, C. C. (1999). Enchantment and disenchantment: the role of community in natural resource conservation. *World Development*, 27(4), 629–649. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0305-750X\(98\)00161-2](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0305-750X(98)00161-2).
- Albro, R. (2005). “The water is ours, carajo!”: Deep citizenship in bolivia’s water war. In J. Nash (Ed.), *Social movements: An anthropological reader* (pp. 249–271). Williston, VT: Blackwell Publishers.
- Barker, M. L. (1980). National parks, conservation, and agrarian reform in Peru. *Geographical Review*, 70(1), 1–18. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/214364>.
- Bebbington, A., & Bury, J. (2013). *Subterranean struggles: New dynamics of mining, oil, and gas in Latin America* (Vol. 8). University of Texas Press.
- Beinart, W., & Hughes, L. (2007). *Environment and empire*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bluwstein, J., & Lund, J. F. (2018). Territorialization by conservation in the SelousNiassa corridor in tanzania. *World Development* 101, 453–465.
- Brockington, D. (2002). *Fortress conservation: The preservation of the Mkomazi Game Reserve*. Tanzania: Indiana University Press.
- Brockington, D. (2004). Community conservation, inequality and injustice: Myths of power in protected area management. *Conservation and Society*, 2(2), 411–432.
- Brockington, D., Duffy, R., & Igoe, J. (2008). *Nature unbound. Conservation, capitalism and the future of protected areas*. London: Earthscan.
- Brockington, D., & Igoe, J. (2006). Eviction for conservation: A global overview. *Conservation and Society*, 4(3), 424–470.

- Brosius, P., Tsing, A. L., & Zerner, C. (2005). *Communities and conservation: histories and politics of community-based natural resource management*. Rowman Altamira.
- Bury, J., Mark, B. G., Carey, M., Young, K. R., McKenzie, J. M., Baraer, M., ... Polk, M. H. (2013). New geographies of water and climate change in Peru: Coupled natural and social transformations in the Santa River Watershed. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 103(2), 363–374. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00045608.2013.754665>.
- Bury, J. T., Mark, B. G., McKenzie, J. M., French, A., Baraer, M., Huh, K. I., ... López, R. J. G. (2011). Glacier recession and human vulnerability in the Yanamarey watershed of the Cordillera Blanca, Peru. *Climatic Change*, 105(1–2), 179–206. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10584-010-9870-1>.
- Buscher, B., & Dressler, W. (2012). Commodity conservation: The restructuring of community conservation in South Africa and the Philippines. *Geoforum*, 43(3), 367–376. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2010.06.010>.
- Cameron, J. D. (2009). Development is a bag of cement': The infrapolitics of participatory budgeting in the Andes. *Development in Practice*, 19(6), 692–701. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09614520903026835>.
- Caruso, E. (2011). Co-management redux: Anti-politics and transformation in the Ashaninka Communal Reserve, Peru. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 17 (6), 608–628. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13527258.2011.618254>.
- Colloredo-Mansfeld, R. (2002). “Don’t Be Lazy, Don’t Lie, Don’t Steal”: Community Justice in the Neoliberal Andes. *American Ethnologist*, 29(3), 637–662. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3805467>.
- Colloredo-Mansfeld, R. (2007). The Power of Ecuador’s Indigenous Communities in an Era of Cultural Pluralism. *Social Analysis*, 51(2), 86–106. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3167/sa.2007.510205>.
- Colloredo-Mansfeld, R. (2009). *Fighting Like a Community: Andean Civil Society in an Era of Indian Uprisings*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Corson, C. (2011). Territorialization, enclosure and neoliberalism: non-state influence in struggles over Madagascar’s forests. *Journal of Peasant Studies*, 38 (4), 703–726. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2011.607696>.
- Cruikshank, J. (2005). *Do glaciers listen? Local knowledge, colonial encounters, and social imagination*. Vancouver and Toronto; Seattle: UBC Press; University of Washington Press.
- Cushman, G. T. (2005). “The Most Valuable Birds in the World”: International Conservation Science and the Revival of Peru’s Guano Industry, 1909–1965. *Environmental History*, 10(3), 477–509. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3986000>.
- Cushman, G. T. (2013). *Guano and the opening of the Pacific World: A global ecological history*. Cambridge University Press.
- Diez, A. (2012). *Tensiones y transformaciones en comunidades campesinas*. Cisepa: Lima.
- Diez, A., & Ortiz, S. (2013). *Comunidades campesinas: nuevos contextos, nuevos procesos*. Presentación. *Anthropologica - Revista de Anthropología Peruana*, 31(31), 5–14.

- Dressler, W., BÜscher, B., Schoon, M., Brockington, D., Hayes, T., Kull, C. A., ... Shrestha, K. (2010). From hope to crisis and back again? A critical history of the global CBNRM narrative. *Environmental Conservation*, 37(1), 5–15. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0376892910000044>.
- Fe Celi, M. (2012). Comunidad campesina y empresa comunal: las nuevas relaciones en los espacios locales. In A. Diez (Ed.), *Tensiones y transformaciones en comunidades campesinas* (pp. 149–162). Lima: CISEPA.
- Fletcher, R. (2014). *Romancing the wild: Cultural dimensions of ecotourism*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Fortmann, L. (1995). Talking claims: Discursive strategies in contesting property. *World Development*, 23(6), 1053–1063.
- Galafassi, G. (2013). Conflictos por los recursos y el territorio en Patagonia Norte. Un caso de estudio en un área entre el Parque Nacional Nahuel Huapi y la cuenca del río Ñirihuau (Argentina). *Scripta Nova: revista electrónica de geografía y ciencias sociales*, 17, 426.
- Goldman, M. (2011). Strangers in their own land: Maasai and wildlife conservation in Northern Tanzania. *Conservation and Society*, 9(1), 65–79.
- Golte, J., & Adams, N. (1990). *Los Caballos de Troya de Los Invasores: Estrategias Campesinas en La Conquista de La Gran Lima* (2nd ed.). Lima: Instituto de Estudios Peruanos.
- Gonzalez-Roglich, M., Southworth, J., & Branch, L. C. (2012). The role of private lands for conservation: Land cover change analysis in the Caldenal savanna ecosystem, Argentina. *Applied Geography*, 34, 281–288. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.apgeog.2011.12.002>.
- Grandia, L. (2012). *Enclosed: Conservation, cattle, and commerce among the Q'eqchi'Maya lowlanders*. University of Washington Press.
- Greaves, T. C., Bolton, R., & Zapata, F. (Eds.). (2009). *Vicos and beyond*. Lanham, MD: AltaMira Press.
- Grötzbach, E. (2003). Tourism in the Cordillera Blanca Region, Peru. *Revista Geográfica*, 133, 53–72. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/40992843>.
- Grove, R. H. (1995). *Green imperialism: Colonial expansion, tropical island Edens and the origins of environmentalism, 1600–1860*. Cambridge University Press.
- Gustafson, B. (2009). Manipulating cartographies: Plurinationalism, autonomy, and indigenous resurgence in Bolivia. *Anthropological Quarterly*, 82(4), 985–1016.
- Harvey, D. (2003). Population, resources and the ideology of science. *Environmentalism: Critical Concepts*, 1, 395.
- Hill, J. L., & Hill, R. A. (2011). Ecotourism in Amazonian Peru: Uniting tourism, conservation and community development. *Geography*, 96, 75–85.
- Himley, M. (2009). Nature conservation, rural livelihoods, and territorial control in Andean Ecuador. *Geoforum*, 40(5), 832–842. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2009.06.001>.

- Hirsch, E., & Stewart, C. (2005). Introduction: Ethnographies of Historicity. *History and Anthropology*, 16(3), 261–274. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02757200500219289>.
- Holmes, G. (2010). The Rich, the Powerful and the Endangered: Conservation Elites, Networks and the Dominican Republic. *Antipode*, 42(3), 624–646. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8330.2010.00766.x>.
- Hull, M. S. (2012). *Government of paper: The materiality of bureaucracy in urban Pakistan*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press.
- Jones, C. (2012). Ecophilanthropy, neoliberal conservation, and the transformation of Chilean, Patagonia's Chacabuco Valley. *Oceania*, 82(3), 250–263.
- Kelly, A. B. (2011). Conservation practice as primitive accumulation. *Journal of Peasant Studies*, 38(4), 683–701. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2011.607695>.
- Lau, G. (2005). Core–periphery relations in the Recuay hinterlands: Economic interaction at Chinchawas, Peru. *Antiquity*, 79(303), 78–99.
- Li, T. M. (2007). *The will to improve: Governmentality, development, and the practice of politics*. Duke University Press.
- Li, F. (2015). *Unearthing conflict: Corporate mining, activism, and expertise in Peru*. Duke University Press, University of California Press.
- Lipton, J. K. (2008). *Human dimensions of conservation, land use, and climate change in Huascarán National Park, Peru*. University of Texas.
- Lipton, J. K. (2014). Lasting legacies: Conservation and communities at Huascarán National Park, Peru. *Society & Natural Resources*, 27(8), 820–833. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/08941920.2014.905888>.
- Lund, C. (2006). Twilight institutions: Public authority and local politics in Africa. *Development and Change*, 37(4), 685–705.
- Lund, C. (2008). *Local politics and the dynamics of property in Africa*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lund, J. F. (2015). Paradoxes of participation: The logic of professionalization in participatory forestry. *Forest Policy and Economics*, 60, 1–6. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.forpol.2015.07.009>.
- Mariateguá, J. C. (2005 [1928]). *Siete Ensayos de Interpretación de la Realidad Peruana*. Lima: Biblioteca “Amauta”.
- Mark, B. G., Bury, J., McKenzie, J. M., French, A., & Baraer, M. (2010). Climate change and tropical andean glacier recession: Evaluating hydrologic changes and livelihood vulnerability in the Cordillera Blanca, Peru. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 100(4), 794–805. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00045608.2010.497369>.
- Méndez-López, M. E., García-Frapolli, E., Pritchard, D. J., Sánchez González, M. C., Ruiz-Mallén, I., Porter-Bolland, L., & Reyes-García, V. (2014). Local participation in biodiversity conservation initiatives: A comparative analysis of different models in South East Mexico. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 145, 321–329. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2014.06.028>.

- Miniconi, R., & Guyot, S. (2010). Conflicts and cooperation in the mountainous Mapuche territory (Argentina) The case of the Nahuel Huapi National Park. *Revue De Geographie Alpine-Journal of Alpine Research*, 98(1–4), 132–144.
- Moore, D. S. (1993). Contesting terrain in Zimbabwe's Eastern highlands: Political ecology, ethnography, and peasant resource struggles. *Economic Geography*, 69 (4), 380–401. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/143596>.
- Moore, D. S. (1998a). Clear waters and muddied histories: Environmental history and the politics of community in Zimbabwe's Eastern highlands. *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 24(2), 377–403. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03057079808708581>.
- Moore, D. S. (1998b). Subaltern struggles and the politics of place: Remapping resistance in Zimbabwe's Eastern highlands. *Cultural Anthropology*, 13(3), 344–381. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1525/can.1998.13.3.344>.
- Moore, D. S. (1999). The crucible of cultural politics: Reworking "Development" in Zimbabwe's Eastern highlands. *American Ethnologist*, 26(3), 654–689. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1525/ae.1999.26.3.654>.
- Moorman, M. C., Peterson, N., Moore, S. E., & Donoso, P. J. (2013). Stakeholder perspectives on prospects for co-management of an old-growth forest watershed near Valdivia, Chile. *Society & Natural Resources*, 26(9), 1022–1036. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/08941920.2012.739676>.
- Morea, J. P. (2016). El lugar de las áreas protegidas en el marco de la planificación territorial en la Argentina: el caso del PET. *Estudios Socioterritoriales*, 19, 31–45.
- Neumann, R. P. (1998). *Imposing wilderness: Struggles over livelihood and nature preservation in Africa* (Vol. 4). University of California Pr..
- Neumann, R. P. (2001). Africa's 'Last Wilderness': Reordering space for political and economic control in colonial Tanzania. *Africa*, 71(04), 641–665. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3366/afr.2001.71.4.641>.
- Nuijten, M., & Lorenzo, D. (2009). Ruling by Record: The meaning of rights, rules and registration in an Andean Comunidad. *Development and Change*, 40(1), 81–103. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-7660.2009.01506.x>.
- Osorio Bautista, S. (2013). *Acción Colectiva y Conflicto de Intereses. El Caso de la Comunidad Campesina de Cátac (Recuay – Ancash)* PhD. Escuela de Posgrado en Antropología, Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú.
- Ospina Peralta, P., & Hollenstein, P. (2015). Territorial coalitions and rural dynamics in Ecuador. Why history matters. *World Development*, 73, 85–95. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2014.10.026>.
- Peluso, N. L. (2003). The politics of specificity and generalisation in conservation matters. *Conservation and Society*, 1(1), 61.
- Perez Calvo, E. (2010). *Historia de la Comunidad Campesina de Catac. Catac: Comunidad Campesina de Catac*.
- Platt, T. (1982). *Estado boliviano y ayllu andino: tierra y tributo en el norte de Potosí* (Vol. 9) Lima: Instituto de Estudios Peruanos.

- Polk, M. H., & Young, K. R. (2013). Trabajo de Investigación 2: Dinámica de la Vegetación en la Cordillera Blanca y su Vinculo Hidro-Socio-Climático. In *Las Areas Naturales Protegidas Informan* (Ed.), *Los Impactos de Cambio Climático Global en la Áreas Naturales Protegidas y sus Zonas de Influencia: El Caso del Parque Nacional Huascarán y la Cuenca del Río Santa* (pp. 23–28). Lima: SERNANP.
- Quiroga, D. (2009). Crafting nature: the Galapagos and the making and unmaking of a “natural laboratory”. *Journal of Political Ecology*, 16(1), 123–140.
- Radcliffe, S. A. (2010). Re-mapping the nation: Cartography, geographical knowledge and Ecuadorean multiculturalism. *Journal of Latin American Studies*, 42(02), 293–323.
- Rappaport, J., & Cummins, T. (2011). *Beyond the Lettered City: Indigenous Literacies in the Andes*. Duke University Press.
- Rasmussen, M. B. (2015). *Andean waterways: Resource politics in the Peruvian highlands*. Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press.
- Rasmussen, M. B. (2016a). Reclaiming the lake: Citizenship and environment-as common-property in Andean Peru. *Focaal*, 74, 13–27.
- Rasmussen, M. B. (2016b). Water futures: Contention in the construction of productive infrastructure in the Peruvian highlands. *Anthropologica*, 58(2), 211–226.
- Rasmussen, M. B. (2017). Tactics of the governed: Figures of abandonment in an Andean Village. *Journal of Latin American Studies*.
- Rasmussen, M. B., & Lund, C. (2018). Reconfiguring frontier spaces: Territorialization and resource control. *World Development*, 101, 388–399.
- Ravnborg, H. (2008). Organising to protect: Protecting landscapes and livelihoods in the Nicaraguan hillsides. *Conservation and Society*, 6(4), 283–292. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4103/0972-4923.49192>.
- Ribot, J. C., & Peluso, N. L. (2003). A theory of access/. *Rural Sociology*, 68(2), 153–181. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1549-0831.2003.tb00133.x>.
- Rodríguez, L. O., & Young, K. R. (2000). Biological diversity of Peru: determining priority areas for conservation. *AMBIO: A Journal of the Human Environment*, 29 (6), 329–337. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1579/0044-7447-29.6.329>.
- Roth, R. (2004). On the colonial margins and in the global hotspot: Park–people conflicts in highland Thailand. *Asia Pacific Viewpoint*, 45(1), 13–32. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8376.2004.00225.x>.
- Salomon, F., & Niño-Murcia, M. (2011). *The Lettered Mountain: A Peruvian Village’s way with writing*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Santos-Granero, F., & Barclay, F. (2002). *La frontera domesticada: historia económica y social de Loreto, 1850–2000*. Fondo Editorial PUCP.
- Seligmann, L. J. (1995). *Between reform and revolution: Political struggles in the Peruvian Andes, 1969–1991*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

- Silvius, K. M. (2004). Bridging the gap between western scientific and traditional indigenous wildlife management. In K. M. Silvius, R. Bodmer, & J. Fragoso (Eds.), *People in nature: Wildlife conservation and management in Latin America*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Sosa, M., & Zwarteveen, M. (2012). Exploring the politics of water grabbing: The case of large mining operations in the Peruvian Andes. *Water Alternatives*, 5(2), 360.
- Steenbergen, D. J., & Visser, L. E. (2016). Caught between mediation and local dependence: Understanding the role of non-government organisations in comanagement of coastal resources in Eastern Indonesia. Durham, NC: Anthropological Forum.
- Sundberg, J. (1998). NGO landscapes in the Maya biosphere reserve, Guatemala. *Geographical Review*, 88(3), 388–412.
- Trentini, F. (2016). Processes of constructing cultural difference in the comanagement of Nahuel Huapi National Park. *Revista De Estudios Sociales*, 55, 32–44. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7440/res55.2016.02>.
- Tsing, A. L., Brosius, P. J., & Zerner, C. (2005). Introduction. Raising questions about communities and conservation. In P. J. Brosius, A. L. Tsing, & C. Zerner (Eds.), *Communities and conservation: Histories and politics of community-based natural resource management*. Lanham, MD: AltaMira Press.
- Valdivia, G., Wolford, W., & Lu, F. (2014). Border crossings: New geographies of protection and production in the Galápagos Islands. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 104(3), 686–701. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00045608.2014.892390>.
- von Benda-Beckmann, K. (1981). Forum shopping and shopping forums: Dispute processing in a Minangkabau Village in West Sumatra. *The Journal of Legal Pluralism and Unofficial Law*, 13(19), 117–159. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07329113.1981.10756260>.
- Wakild, E. (2007). Resources, communities, and conservation: The creation of national parks in revolutionary Mexico under President Lazaro Cardenas, 1934–1940.
- Wakild, E. (2009a). Border Chasm: International Boundary Parks and Mexican Conservation, 1935–1945. *Environmental History*, 14(3), 453–475. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/envhis/14.3.453>.
- Wakild, E. (2009b). Purchasing Patagonia: The contradictions of conservation in freemarket Chile. “Lost in Transition” in Chile: A Critique of Neoliberalism from Pinochet to “The Third Way,” ed. Bill Alexander,. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, forthcoming.
- Wakild, E. (2013). Environmental justice, environmentalism, and environmental history in twentieth-century Latin America. *History Compass*, 11(2), 163–176. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/hic3.12027>.
- Wakild, E. (2014). Acts of courage, acts of culture: The wilderness act and Latin America. *Environmental History*, 19(4), 728–734. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/envhis/emu071>.
- Wakild, E. (2015). Parks, people, and perspectives: Historicizing conservation in Latin America. In G. Wuerthner, E. Crist, & T. Butler (Eds.), *Protecting the wild* (pp. 41–52). Island Press/Center for Resource Economics.

West, P., Igoe, J., & Brockington, D. (2006). Parks and peoples: The social impact of protected areas. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 35(1), 251–277. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev.anthro.35.081705.123308>.

Young, K. R. (1997). Wildlife conservation in the cultural landscapes of the central Andes. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 38(3–4), 137–147. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0169-2046\(97\)00029-7](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0169-2046(97)00029-7).

Zimmerer, K. S., & Carter, E. D. (2002). Conservation and Sustainability in Latin America and the Caribbean. *Yearbook. Conference of Latin Americanist Geographers*, 27, 207–249. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/25765908>.

Endnotes

¹ Author interview, May 17, 2014. All interviews were conducted in Spanish by the author.

² The increase of member families in the campesino community was met with some ambiguity from the community members that I talked to. This was not interpreted as a sign of young people returning to the countryside: the benefits provided by membership outweigh the mandatory labor and participation, and they attributed in particular labor opportunities from the community businesses, available to members only, as the main factor drawing new families to join in. The increase of membership therefore also suggests that campesino communities such as Catac undergo transformations whereby agropastoral activities increasingly become secondary.

³ Since fieldwork was completed, this option no longer exists due to a breach of the contract between the Universidad Mayor Santiago Atún de Mayolo in Huaraz and the leadership in Catac.

⁴ Author fieldnotes, July 12, 2014.

⁵ An ayllu is an Inca word, denominating a kinship group of production (Platt, 1982). The two ayllus concerning the territories claimed by Catac today were Picos and Allauco.

⁶ Author interviews, 2014 and 2015.

⁷ See *El Comercio*, Sunday October 20, 1963, p. 11: “Los Comuneros Respetarán Instalaciones en Huachacoto”; author interviews.

⁸ Author interview, May 28, 2014.

⁹ Indeed, Catac is a regional reference point. Other communities are referring to Catac and Vicos as exemplary models of communities that have manage to claim their historical right. Vicos is well known in the Andeanist anthropological literature for the involvement of Cornell University in the community purchase of their territories (Greaves, Bolton, & Zapata, 2009). Today, Vicos is known for not allowing the park staff to enter their territory due to mining activities. My own initiation into matters of territory and resources in Catac was, indeed, related to a very physical encounter between state entities supporting mining and communities resisting this project (Rasmussen, 2016a).

¹⁰ Author fieldnotes, June 6, 2014.

¹¹ The Comunidad Campesina is formally regulated by its internal statute. The internal statute—*Compendio de Normas Internas de la Comunidad Campesina de Catac*—is likened to the Constitution of Peru in that it “regulates the institutional life of the campesino community of Catac” (p. 5). It stipulates the norms and regulations for the governance and management of the community. The most current version is from 2012. The community members are often quite adept in referring to particular paragraphs, and during the community assemblies that I attended (I have described such meeting in detail in Rasmussen, 2015, Chapter 3) select person would often eagerly wave the booklet of the internal regulations so as to underscore the legal backing of their arguments. This document is the legal basis of the collective, outlining the competencies of the governing bodies consisting of the presidency, eight specialized committees, the OCI (Organ for Internal Control) and the internal prosecutor. The task of the latter one is to control that the body politic is acted out according to the internal statute.

¹² Author interview, May 13, 2014.

¹³ This and the following excerpts from the letter are author’s translations of the original Spanish version.

¹⁴ Author interviews with the former legal representative of the Catac Comunidad Campesina (June 21 and 26, 2014) and the current legal advisor of the Huascarán National Park (July 7, 2014).

¹⁵ Author fieldnotes, July 5, 2014.

¹⁶ Author interview, July 7, 2014.